

Applic. No. 10/608,631

Amdt. dated August 13, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 13, 2004

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-19 remain in the application. Claims 1, 2, and 19 have been amended.

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 1-11, 14, 16, 18, and 19 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by either Gelfand et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,002,731) (hereinafter "Gelfand"), Haberstump (U.S. Patent No. 2,358,507), or Sadwith (U.S. Patent No. 2,943,424) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 8, lines 6-11 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

Applic. No. 10/608,631

Amdt. dated August 13, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 13, 2004

a conveyor disposed in said housing and constructed for suspending laundry goods therefrom, and for moving the laundry goods suspended therefrom in a circulation in said housing

Claim 19 calls for, *inter alia*:

means constructed for suspending laundry goods therefrom, and transporting the laundry goods suspended therefrom in a circulation in said housing.

Anticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed invention as well as disclosing structure which is capable of performing the recited functional limitations. RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc., 730 F.2d 1440, 1444, 221 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1984). W.L. Gore and Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The Gelfand reference discloses a dishwasher of an ultrasonic type to wash dishes.

Accordingly, the Gelfand reference does not disclose each and every element of the present invention as well as disclosing structure, which is capable of performing the recited

Applic. No. 10/608,631

Amdt. dated August 13, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 13, 2004

functional limitations, as recited in claims 1 and 19.

Specifically, the structure of Gelfand is not constructed for suspending laundry goods from a conveyor. Therefore claims 1 and 19 are not anticipated by Gelfand.

The Haberstump reference discloses a washer for washing utensils.

Accordingly, the Haberstump reference does not disclose each and every element of the present invention as well as disclosing structure, which is capable of performing the recited functional limitations, as recited in claims 1 and 19. Specifically, the structure of Haberstump is not constructed for suspending laundry goods from a conveyor. Therefore claims 1 and 19 are not anticipated by Haberstump.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Haberstump, dependent claims 2-11, 14, 16, and 18 are believed to be allowable over Haberstump as well.

The Sadwith reference discloses a cleaning machine for automatically cleaning or washing parts that are normally collected in tote pans.

Applic. No. 10/608,631

Amdt. dated August 13, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 13, 2004

Accordingly, the Sadwith reference does not disclose each and every element of the present invention as well as disclosing structure, which is capable of performing the recited functional limitations, as recited in claims 1 and 19. Specifically, the structure of Sadwith is not constructed for suspending laundry goods from a conveyor. Therefore claims 1 and 19 are not anticipated by Sadwith.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Sadwith, dependent claims 2-11, 14, 16, and 18 are believed to be allowable over Sadwith as well.

It is appreciatively noted from item 3 of the Office action, that claim 12, 13, 15, and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claims have not been amended as indicated by the Examiner, as the claims are believed to be patentable in their existing form.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 19. Claims 1 and 19 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Applic. No. 10/608,631

Amdt. dated August 13, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 13, 2004

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$110 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Alfred K. Dassler  
52,794

  
For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

August 13, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101